DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 113 626 CG 010 128

AUTHOR Wynne, Edward
TITLE Privacy and Socialization to Adulthood.
PUB DATE [74]
NOTE 28p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Washington, D.C., March 30-April 3, 1975)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS *Family Role; *Individualism; Parent Child Relationship; *Parent Responsibility; Social Influences; *Socialization; Speeches; Urban Environment; Values; *Youth Problems

ABSTRACT

This speech discusses the negative effects of privacy on youth. The great technological developments, bureaucratization, and concentration of life in urban and suburban areas have greatly increased personal privacy and reduced close personal contacts. This paper discusses several studies which suggest that the above factors lead young people to have ambivalent attitudes toward privacy: on the one hand they value privacy highly, while on the other hand they desire close personal ties. Moreover, data show that privacy leads to antisocial acts as well as self-destructive acts. The punishment of antisocial acts by governmental agencies is counter-productive; certain basic changes in the American socialization process should be introduced to deal with the problem positively. Parents and other concerned adults should be given improved incentives to personally observe, and accept responsibility for, the conduct of children. Children and youths should be encouraged to spend more time within the personal observation of other youths or responsible adults and establish on-going relationships with them. Finally, the philosophical implications of our current high evaluation of personal privacy should be reconsidered. The author has tried to answer possible objections to his propositions. (SE)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED113626

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Privacy and Socialization to Adulthood

Formerly with the working title, "Improving the Family as a Socialization System."

Edward Wynne
College of Education, Chicago Circle Campus
University of Illinois

Man is a social being, and childhood is largely a period of preparation for living as an adult in a social environment. There is evidence that modern children and adolescents are being increasingly surrounded with privacy during their upbringing. As a result of this privacy, they are less adequately prepared to become fulfilled adults. To deal with this challenge, it may be appropriate to change the expectations, conventions and laws which structure the patterns of intergenerational relations in America. These changes could diminish the privacy surrounding childhood, family life and child-rearing, and thus better prepare children and adolescents for the complexity and gratifications of adulthood.

DEFINITIONS

But before we go further, a semantic issue must be recognized. The obverse of privacy is imprivacy, but that antonym carries a strong negative loading in American ears--which simply reflects the high value privacy carries in contemporary culture. Since this essay is finally an effort to stimulate us to reconsider that high evaluation, it will strive to attach more neutral connotation to the terminology it applies. Thus, we will call the lack of privacy "observation," which is quite as accurate as imprivacy, and has a somewhat less negative connotation. Of course, we could even make the matter

ED 113628

more complex, by substituting "secrecy", or "withdrawal" for privacy. But lets simply settle for privacy and observation.

The proposition that privacy is increasing may sound strange to many of us, since we are all familiar with charges (and evidence) of growing phone bugging, the maintenance of secret government files, centralized, computerized credit check systems and the like. Aren't these developments symptomatic of a decline in privacy? Well, not quite. We should recognize two different forms of privacy: personal and impersonal. Personal privacy means that our conduct, history and attitudes are concealed from the persons immediately surrounding us: our neighbors, fellow travelers in public transportation, teachers, relatives, or employers. Impersonal privacy means that our conduct, history and attitudes are unknown to persons and institutions that usually have remote and intangible contacts with us.

At some level of perception, many of us may assume privacy means security, and that observation means the knowledge collected will be used to our disadvantage. But the definitions presented above do not justify such a distinction. We may be regularly observed by our spouses, our doctors, or compassionate friends, and we may have privacy when we take a risk by swimming alone in dangerous waters, when we suffer some grave disappointment and no one knows or cares. In other words, the full meaning of privacy or observation is dependent on the relationship between the subject and potential observers.

We understand that privacy or observation is largely a matter of degree. Its intensity can be affected by the proximity or skill of the observer, or the observer's relationship to the subject, e.g., an observer who is intimate to the subject may be either less intrusive, since he will be more tactful, or more intrusive, since his broader knowledge of the subject can permit him to make more profound observations.

The contrast between personal and impersonal observation is significant. We realize rather quickly when we are being personally observed. We see the reactions of observers, hear their comments, or have their gossip get back to us. In the case of impersonal observation, we may not know when the phone is tapped, a file is maintained on us, or computer records are kept of our late debt payments. Part of the resentment of impersonal observation is the very difficulty of reacting to the intrusion. If the information collected is untrue or inaccurate, we do not know of the collection process, or how the information has been evaluated. If the information portrays us in a good light, we may not know we are being praised. Furthermore, covert observation does not provide us with clues to restructure our conduct to conform to the norms we may have been violating. And so observation may be interperted as a form of entrapment, not conducted to create necessary or healthy conformity, but to punish accidental or spontaneous mistakes.

There are socialization implications to this contrast between personal and impersonal observation. Personal observation typically provides the subject with feedback, which can range from praise to sharp criticism. This feedback is a form of positive or aversive reinforcement, which facilitates learning social norms. Impersonal observation is not without feedback. Unfortunately, the positive feedback from such systems is often highly abstract. For instance, consider credit cards, and the computer credit systems which make them feasible. Such cards are a form of positive reinforcement for our conduct in maintaining a good credit rating. However, the positive elements of such reinforcement are highly intangible: we really recognize the value of credit cards when our credit rating is lowered or taken away. And such deprivation is aversive reinforcement. Punishing. Thus, impersonal

observation systems, over time, gradually generate pools of user resentments, directed at their comparatively visible aversive elements. This resentment may not be counterbalanced by the abstract benefits delivered by the system. Presumably, such resentments are what concerned Skinner when he proposed development of social environments relying solely on positive reinforcement. (1972) In addition to the resentment it stores up, impersonal observation often generates only ambiguous feedback, which needs skilled interpretation. So a comparatively unsocialized person surrounded by impersonal observation may never receive the timely information and reinforcement to permit him to attain adequate socialization.

Another important factor affecting privacy and observation are the incentives persons have to act as observers: to collect information, analyze it, and usually to disseminate it in some form. Intense personal observation is conducted for a variety of motives: employers observing subordinates; parents and siblings observing family members for protective or simply curious motives; neighbors, relatives and co-workers collecting information to lend richness to life and provide material for friendly (or hostile) gossip, or policemen, teachers, or salesclerks make appropriate observations in the responsible pursuit of their jobs. Impersonal observation is conducted largely by salaried, trained persons, who collect information for bureaucratic, administrative purposes, e.g., for law enforcement agencies, credit systems, or schools.

THE GROWTH OF PERSONAL PRIVACY

There are many forces that have increased the personal privacy around children and adolescents in America. Urbanization and suburbanization are major causes. While urbanization has surrounded them with many more potential observers than might be found in a small town or farm, many of these observers

(e.g., on the street or in the urban school) have neither the background nor the incentives to enable them to be careful personal observers to the children they see around them. Of course, they may occasionally see some child act in a conspiciously "good" or "bad" manner, but unless they have some significant relationship with the child's parents, they may be unwilling to intervene in the situation. In a suburban environment, the situation is slightly different. Sometimes, very few adults are in the community in the daytime, and so there are just less adults available to observe children away from their homes.

Urban and suburban growth has also facilitated personal privacy by lessening the diversity of potential observers living in any community. And this decrease is especially true of suburbs, where zoning codes and development patterns tend to create relatively homogeneous communities, that are even removed from the heterogeneity that can be created by geographic proximity to business and commerce. Diversity can stimulate observation by varying (a) the incentives that people have to engage in observation and (b) the perspectives they apply. Where the observers are of a comparatively homogeneous class, certain conventions will arise that will make certain conduct irrelevant or "invisible"--just as skid row direlects, after awhile, probably ignore other alcoholics lying unconscious on the street. Conversely, in smaller, persisting communities—like the world described in the Spoon River Anthology--the very diversity of personalities and styles gives each person or class of persons a stimulus to consider the conduct of others.

Student personal privacy has inevitably been increased by the growth in the size and the bureaucratization of urban and suburban schools. Teachers do not know enough about many of the pupils they see to make significant

observations. Also, the transiency of their contacts, and the size of the teaching staff, discourages teachers from trying to become more familiar with pupils by exchanging information (i.e., gossip?) with their colleagues. Of course, teachers try to observe students enough to prevent gross violations of certain norms, but because of the superficiality of this observation, it is hard to internalize those norms. Thus, the moment the student is out of sight of the teacher, violations may occur.

Another contemporary force stimulating privacy has been the trend towards the decline in the number and variety of persons living in similar households. Thus, between 1900 and 1972, the average number of persons living in a typical household declined from 4.76 to 3.11--that is 50% (U.S. Census, 1973, p. 39). The decline is more than the outcome of a decrease in the size of nuclear families: many 19th century households often included servants, boarders and more remote relatives (Laslett, 1973, p. 484). This decline is the product of a number of developments. Many of them are technological. Among the technological development has been: the increase in equipment which has simplified housekeeping; the growing cost of labor, which has made paid servants extremely expensive; and the development of different modes of house construction, which has made housing for individual persons more economically feasible.

The increased geographic mobility in society has also increased personal privacy. The mobility has been reflected in many ways. For instance, consider the growth of automobile ownership and use; air travel, and long-range employee transfers by nation wide corporations. For students, in particular, the mobility has been reflected in the increasing reliance on bus transportation to school, the availability of automobilies to many adolescents, and the comparative

accessibility of transportation to geographically remote areas away from home:colleges, beaches, mountains or overseas travel. The mobility fosters privacy by permitting us to travel in private cars, or to locations where we are either comparatively unknown, or where we are newcomers, or are surrounded by newcomers. In either of the latter situations, the observers about us have only modest incentives and resources to engage in perceptive observation. It is like strangers exchanging intimacies on a commercial plane: one reason such exchanges occur is that both parties assume that the infomation will be received in a low key fashion, and never "applied", by either observer, to the subjects' lives, because they have never met before and will probably never meet again.

The increased bureaucratization in society, and the refinement of methods of describing and classifying impersonal observation has also facilitated geographic mobility for the young, with the consequent decline in personal observation. For instance, the development of the Carnegie unit credit systems in high schools, and nationwide accrediting systems for schools and colleges has made it easier for students to transfer their credits from one institution to another. As a result, students do transfer more frequently. For instance, a study of the 1967 graduating class of one major state college system disclosed that 30 percent had attended three colleges and 17 percent had attended four or more. Each of these figures is a six percent-point increase over the 1957 rates (Newman, 1971, p. 9). Thus, students are more likely to be strangers to each other even though they are currently enrolled on the same campus (Cusick, 1973). Furthermore, students and faculty have a lessened incentive to carefully observe one-another, since it has become increasingly likely that students will leave via transfers before the observations ripen into intimacy.

Again, the intensive age-grading practiced in elementary and high schools means that older students--who are more capable of absorbing adult perspectives--are not regularly brought into contact with younger students. As a result, each student in a cohort of students is only in routine contact with other students in his cohort: they are observed by a group possessing only the same knowledge and ignorances as they do.

The increase of literacy and the media has also stimulated an increase in privacy. It is now easier to absorb certain forms of information, and even learn significant skills, without personal interchanges with other persons. In addition, the media makes it increasingly possible for people to amuse themselves (e.g., television, books, records) without entering situations where personal contact is required--and thus where observation is rendered possible.

Because of the complex implications of the media for privacy and observation, some amplifications of these implications are appropriate. The media is an observation system. Essentially, it is an impersonal one: most citizens are not conscious that their good or bad conduct may be reported in the media. But the impersonal observation of the media probably has a significant influence on many persons who never expect to have their conduct reported in the media. Its daily dissemination of stories about success, failure and tribulation do provide us all with models, and generates reinforcement for all forms of conducts by readers or viewers. In this way, the media provides some of the stimulus traditionally generated by gossip and personal observation. However, there is an important distinction between the role of traditional observers and that of the media. The long term motive for media dissemination must be profit: if that motive is not steadily kept in mind,

any unsubsidized medium will go out of business. In contrast, traditional personal observers (e.g., parents, co-workers, gossips) were probably first stimulated by protective and norm-maintaining desires, and their observing and dissemination fitted into that framework. Because of the profit motive, the first aim of any media is to be bought, and to do that, its contents must stress novelty. Often, novelty is the violation of norms. However, traditional personal observers understand that one does not casually disseminate all norm-destructive conduct--sometimes such dissemination may create even more disorder. But the media, to make its profit, must escape from such inhibitions on dissemination. In order to escape, it has stressed the "professionalization" of its role: the professional does not judge, he merely reports. The editorial page is for judgment. And so a great deal of information in the media is presented without morals apparently being drawn. But whenever one human person transmits a significant norm violation story to another person, there is usually a tone of criticism or distress interwoven with the story. And so the substitution of media information for traditional personal observers has increased the norm-destructive information casually put before the young.

The telephone has done much to foster privacy. Conversations can now easily occur between two persons without anyone (barring wiretapping) being able to observe both parties in the conversation. And while the concept of a soft-voiced face-to-face personal conversation has a long tradition, the fact that both parties in such conversations were often under observation if they met in some semi-private public place created significant obertones. This possibility creates inhibitions for the participants in tete-a-tetes--friends may drop by to join the conversation, and if the two participants

project an aurora of intimacy, even that aurora communicates information to observers. Of course, the telephone also has the potential of facilitating observation--people may call, and essentially try and find out what we are doint--but reasonably adept persons soon learn to deal with this potential.

A critical cause for the increase in privacy around children and adolescents is the decline in paid employment and household chores. For instance labor force participation rates for youth 14-19 declined from 64% in 1945 to 43% in 1962 (U.S. Census, 1963, p. 71). It is not as easy to statistically demonstrate the concurrent decline in childrens' and adolescents' household chores, but enlargement of housekeeping technology (including television dinners, premixed foods, etc.) has probably lessened the amount of time needed for child help in such chores. Paid employment or household chores for children inevitably stimulate observations, since the supervisor--the employer or the parent--must insure the job is done. As a result, the supervisor gives focussed attention to how the subjects spend their time. Questions are asked such as: are you working hard, do you understand the assigned task, are you properly dressed, are you displaying the appropriate demeanor, are you present on the job?

Another factor that we cannot ignore has been the decline in family farms. And between 1900 and 1968, the proportion of American families living on farms shrunk from 54% to 5.2% (U.S. Census, 1963, A-34-50; U.S. Agriculture, 1969, p. 441). We are all familiar with discussions about the isolation of farm life. However, farm children, while they were required to participate in family chores, were naturally subject to significant observation by parents. And the parents were quite qualified to exercise that scrutinity. They understood the subject matter of the childrens' work, and were close

to the scene of the tasks (Stadtfeld, 1972). In comparison, many modern parents are inadequately qualified to evaluate their childrens' school performance--how can they really tell whether their child is doing well in physics, or set theory?--and are often physically remote from the scene of where the work is actually done. Of course, they receive a report card, but the card represents the teacher's evaluation, which the parent may be ambivalent about accepting. The parents' understand the appropriate role is usually to support the teacher, but that support is delivered with far less certainty that criticisms about failure to hoe corn or milk the cows on time.

The sum effect of all these forces is that many young people, even though they are in frequent contact with other persons--especially members of their own cohort--actually lead extremely isolated lives. These patterns of isolation are reflected in much of the music popular with adolescents, with its themes of loneliness, detachment, lack of intimacy and yearnings for love and understanding. They lyrics are often highly solipsistic, but are a logical response to the youth environment.

SOME HYPOTHESES

If we accept the views of many social theoriests, this growth in personal privacy will lead to significant effects on the lives of the young. Man becomes a social being by learning, and wants to become one. If this development is not facilitated, difficulties should arise (Durkheim, 1951; Eisenstadt, 1956; Goffman, 1963; Homans, 1950; and Klapp, 1969). These effects can be suggested by a series of hypotheses which will be presented below. Each hypothesis will be accompanied by a brief explanatory discussion. At the conclusion of this presentation, the hypothesis will be tested against certain available data.

1. Growing proportions of young people will give increasing value to the attainment of privacy. If children are raised in comparative privacy, they will be accustomed to that state. As a result, they will be uncomfortable at the idea of being deprived of the environment to which they are accustomed. Thus, they will place a high value on seclusion and/or being in environments where they are more likely to be surrounded by persons who (a) will not observe them, or (b) who will be very like themselves, and thus less likely to be intrustive observers.

2. Young people will have increasing suspicion and resentment towards persons and institutions that may significantly observe their lives. In other words, these observers will be seen as intruders and potential subverters, as compared to supportive and helpful agencies.

3. Young people will be increasingly prone to engage in anti-social acts. Without feedback that is typically provided by adult observation, children and adolescents are going to be unable to acquire the skills and attitudes appropriate to a pro-social adulthood.

4. Young people will be increasingly prone to engage in self-destructive acts and other extreme forms of withdrawal. If man is persistently deprived of the knowledge, skills, attitudes and environments that foster sociability, he will tend to become increasingly lonely and morose, and eventually seek release in injuring others and/or injuring or destroying himself.

5. Young people will have increasingly ambivalent and anxiety-provoking views about privacy and community. On one hand, they will value highly privativistic perspectives. On the other, their inevitable need for community will stimulate them to strive to join or create communities. However, the combination of privativistic and pro-community views will engulf their efforts with confusion and frustration.

THE DATA

The following data will be presented in the same numerical sequence as the preceding hypothesis.

1. Increasing Value to Privacy:

Between 1948 and 1968, successive entering freshman classes at Haverford College took the Minnesota Multiphasic Inventory, an objective test of attitudes (Heath, 1968, pp. 67, 88). Some of the trends in answers to that test are highly relevant. For instance, between 1948 and 1968, the proportion of students who said they could be happy living alone in a cabin in the woods or mountains went from 23% to 45%; the percentage who said they were likely to sit alone at parties as opposed to joining the crowd increased from 23% to 50%, and the percentage that described themselves as "good mixers" declined from 77% to 43%.

Other trend studies of college student attitudes has shown equivalent results. For instance, in two Yankelovich surveys of a national sample of college students (in 1969 and 1973), the importance of "privacy" as a value rose from 61% to 71% (1973, p. 16). The 1973 survey also covered non-college youth of college age. It showed a gradual growth of college type values among these youths.

2. Suspicion about Intrusive Agencies:

In the Yankelovich surveys, the importance of patriotism and religion among students declined from 38% to 35% (in 1969) respectively, to 28% and 19% (in 1973) (p. 16). These two values systems represent institutions that inevitably inject themselves in our lives if we deem them important: they establish concrete standards of conduct, attempt to measure our conduct against those standards, and point out instances where we fail to meet those standards. The more vital patriotism and religion in our lives, the more they will intrude on our privacy. Another

Yankelovich survey disclosed that between 1968 and 1971, the proportion of college students who thought they would not mind being bossed on a job fell from 56% to 36% (1972, p. 28). Two other attitudinal surveys of Dartmouth and University of Michigan students (in 1952, and 1968, and 1969 respectively) asked whether students thought human nature was "fundamentally cooperative." Agreement declined from 66% to 70% respectively, to 51% and 55% (Hogue, 1970). Presumably, persons who see the world as fundamentally uncooperative will view its citizens and institutions with consideralbe suspicion.

3. Increased Anti-Social Conduct:

Between 1957 and 1971, the rate of delinquency cases (per 1,000 children 10-17) disposed of by U.S. juvenile courts went from 19.8 to 34.1 (White House Conference, 1970, p. 180; U.S., HEW, 1972). Between 1950 and 1971, the estimated number of illegitimate births for all unmarried white females 15-19 rose from 5.1/1,000 such females to 10.5 (U.S., HEW, 1968; U.S., HEW, 1974 (b)). Such births represent an anti-social acts. That is, they demonstrate that increasing proportions of males were willing and able to make young unmarried women pregnant: such pregnancies tend to cause harmful complications to both the young women and their infants. Another remarkable thing is that the pregnancies occurred during the period when the information available about, and the techniques developed for, contraception were greater than any earlier period in history. We should also recall the student demonstrations, building seizures and bombings of the late 60's. These episodes constituted the most violent period of student unrest in American history (Feuer, 1969).

One other symptom of the growth of anti-social conduct has been the popularization of the term "ripping-off." Ripping-off is a euphemism for stealing. But it implies that stealing consists of ripping-off some object

that projects out of a base or foundations; it does not so much involve an act of penetration or intrusion, but merely taking something that is almost partly proffered by the conduct of the owner. In contrast, stealing implies stealthy or forceful entry, or flight. Presumably, ripping-off has become a popular term among youths because youth thievery has increased; and thieves will naturally foster a vocabulary that mitigates their violations.

4. Increasing Self-Destructive Acts:

Between 1949 and 1971, (the most recent years for which data is available.) the sucide rate for white males 15-19, increased from 3.8/100,000 in that cohort born alive to 10.3 (U.S., HEW, Public Health, 1974 (a); U.S., HEW, Personal Communications, 1974 (b)). During the same years, the adult suicide rate remained relatively constant. In 1972, a national survey disclosed that 11% of youths 16-17 described themselves as users of ethical psychoactive drugs for non-medical reasons: 29% described themselves as marajuana users (National Commission, 1973, pp. 65 and 58). A typical survey disclosed that between 1968-1973 the proportion of seventh grade boys in one area who began drinking during the previous year rose from 52% to 72%. Another survey of a national sample of students disclosed that 25% of the male eleventh graders surveyed reported being drunk four or more times in the past year (U.S., HEW, Public Health Service, 1974, ( ), p. 128).

5. Ambivalence about Privacy and Community:

In the late 1960's, and early 1970's, many youths attempted to form communes, to enable them to engage in non-privativistic living. Many other youths evinced interest in experimenting with communal living: 36% of the college students interviewed in the Yankelovich 1971 survey wanted to spend at least some time living in a commune (1972, p. 36). However, many studies

have demonstrated that most of these communal efforts were remarkably short lived (Katz, 1973; Keyes, 1973; Houriet, 1971). The essential cause for their failure was the inability of their youthful post-adolescent founders to create strong group commitments to stimulate their members to sacrifice their goods or egos on behalf of the collective. Again, in 1972, Senator George McGovern was nominated as the Democratic candidate for President. In the public eyes, he was viewed as representative of the aspirations of the youthful left. And many persons identified with that class of political activists were, initially, highly supportive of his candidacy. However, many analysts have contended that a significant reason for McGovern's disasterous defeat in the ensuing campaign was the failure of his supporters to develop a coherent, disciplined and synchronized campaign organization (e.g., O'Brien, 1974). Finally, the Yankelovich surveys have shown a persisting dedication by college youths to the concepts of love and friendship: in 1971, the students surveyed placed love and friendship as their two highest personal goals, rating the two at 88% and 87%, respectively, in their preference (1972, p. 136). However, many of these same students are apparently willing to condone extra-marital sexual relations (acceptable to 52% of males and 33% of females) and having children without marriage (acceptable to 65% of the males and 33% of the females) (pp. 148, 149). They also want more emphasis in life on self-expression (80%) (p. 149). It is not clear how groups of young people holding these rather individualistic attitudes will be capable of developing persistent, strong, loving or friendly relations--since friendship or love inevitably involve sublimation and commitment. Furthermore, the dichotomy in male/female views around such issues as illegitimacy may actually be unconsciously aspiring to various forms of exploitation, under the guise of fostering "liberated" relationships. Such conduct is a far cry from love.

CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION

Presumably, the hypotheses have been sustained. It is not hard to sense a certain pattern of acceleration in many of the forces that affect the character of privacy around children and adolescents in America. Ideology, technology and affluence have increased the total amount of personal privacy in society. As a result, the proportion of poorly socialized persons will increase, and anxiety and anti-social conduct will intensify. To control this conduct, responsible adult society will be tempted to increase reliance on impersonal observation and control, since such arrangements are facilitated by the same forces, i.e., technology, that stimulated the growth of personal privacy. Furthermore, the very "invisibility" of impersonal observation and indirect control may enable its managers to escape from the criticism which is typically directed at efforts to foster intensified personal observation.

Unfortunately, the secretiveness of techniques of impersonal observation makes them prone to abuse. As a result, they are vulnerable to public attack. But, there are also other serious objections to impersonal observations and indirect control. The techniques do not provide the simple feedback and direct reinforcement to subjects that fosters socialization in the young. The systems are just too remote and abstract. And so, when youthful offenders engage in anti-social conduct which will be monitored or perhaps punished by these systems, it often seems that the offenders are not really sensitive to the risks they take by their conduct. For instance, consider persons who engage in anti-social conduct of the following sorts:

*** Phone freaks who defraud phone companies of millions of dollars for "sport."

*** Students who buy term papers from cribbing agencies.

*** Demonstrators who take over buildings to fight the "system."

*** Students who sell drugs to other students.

*** Males who make single young females pregnant.

*** Hangers on in college towns who cheat to get on welfare.

These actions can potentially lead to serious consequences for the offenders: jail, expulsion from college, arrests, clubbings by police, lifetime support obligations, and humiliation. But it seems as if the youths involved often do not take their risks seriously. And this very lack in sensitivity then stimulates them to react with anger and surprise when it is proposed that their conduct will result in grave consequences to them. They just can't believe that all those remote institutions really have teeth and claws, and will protect themselves and their constituencies.

Of course, this process of dramatic aversive consequences developing is "educational" for youthful offenders and persons standing-by. But the process is very erratic. Extreme aversive reinforcement is an awkward device for fostering learning. It stimulates so many other overtones that is is only justified in the most severe exegencies. At the time I am writing, some of these dramatic aversive techniques (e.g., anti-riot squads) are less necessary--in part because their application in the immediate past (say between 1970-1973) has had some dampening effect on anti-social conduct by groups of youths. But the preceding data has revealed that, while group anti-social conduct has declined, there has been a continuing tendency towards intensifying individual anti-social acts.

It is evident that we need to begin to develop new youth environments, that place increased emphasis on personal observation: environments, that decrease the amount of personal privacy around the young. As such environments evolve, we will gradually find less need for the existing impersonal

observation and control systems. Youths will act in a socialized fashion not because they fear big brother, but because it pleases persons immediately around them who they care about, and because if they act improperly, they will stimulate displeasure in people they know and love, and who love them. These new environments will have some--but not all—of the reinforcing characteristics suggested by Skinner. They will parallel his proposal, because they will first give emphasis to positive reinforcement and will not rely on the sporadic, severe, aversive reinforcement typically applied by impersonal observation. They will diverge from Skinner's proposal because they will not rely solely on positive reinforcement, but also maintain the capability of gradually applying aversive controls when circumstances require it.

Creation of such environments require important changes in many of the institutions currently surrounding the young. While readers can sense the general characteristics of these new environments, this paper will, in a moment, sketch some specific details. However, that sketch will be preceded by a discussion of some of the overall objections that I can anticipate will be raised to such environments. A threshold consideration of these objections can clear the ideological air, so that the new environments can be seen in appropriate perspective. Essentially, one can expect that the new environments will be criticized as retrogressive, romantic, unduly manipulative or alien to the current spirit of our society.

The charge of retrogression is irrelevant. It assumes that history is essentially "progressive," that "old" is bad, "now" is good, and "new and different" is better. Of course, the myth/rules of progress much of American thought, and in a sense it is unanswerable--if someone truly believes this, then calling a proposal retrogressive does permit that believer to stop serious evaluation.

But that form of analysis also means that the changes in youth conduct that occurred between 1950 and 1972--and which were outlined earlier--were all also "progress." In other words, the current youth patterns of delinquency, drugs, alcholism, suicide, illegitimacy and so on are all "better" than they were in the past, and if they continue to intensify, that will mean even greater progress. If this is progress, perhaps we should take a second look at retrogression.

Presumably, the charge of romanticism implies that the goals implicitly proposed are incapable of attainment. Of course, in human life, almost no important and complex goal is fully attained. But this should have nothing to do with whether men analyze, aspire, plan, and try to react in a thoughtful and responsible manner to an apparently grave public issue. While the goals proposed may never be fully realized, striving towards such change is probably less "romantic" than assuming that society will placidly continue to accept intensifying youth alienation, with the terrible symptoms that accompany it. Also, if intensifying alienation continues, some dramatic, unexpected and drastic remedy will eventually be propsoed and adopted to change things. That remedy may be even "worse" or more implausible, than those we now see as romantic.

Young people are always manipulated, and must be. When we say that they seem to have certain intensifying anti-social attitudes, those attitudes have arisen because of the environments of personal privacy in which adults "decided" to have them raised. In other words, we manipulated children and adolescents into their current attitudes. And, if we are not going to let children and adolescents die at birth, we are going to continue to manipulate them into one

set of attitudes or another. The manipulation occurs when we love them or hate them, when we feed them,when we send them to church or synagogue or do not send them when other children are sent, when we let them watch television or decide not to have a set, when we force them to attend one kind of school rather than another, when we eat dinner with them and they absorb values from our table talk, or when we let them eat by themselves and diminish their contact with adults. We never let children do whatever they want, since the resources we make available to them are always limited; and whatever boundaries our decisions set for those resources determine much of the attitudes the children will evolve from their experiences. The only humans that do not manipulate others are psychopaths, who (supposedly) will not have their conduct affected by others in their presence, and act in a random and chaotic fashion. In such instances, the normal persons in their presence may actually disregard the conduct of the psychopath in planning their own conduct; then we might say that the psychopath has not had any effect on those about him. He has not manipulated them. But otherwise manipulation is a responsibility we cannot and will not avoid. All we can do--which is the worst of all worlds--is to manipulate and deny we are doing it.

As far as the current spirit of our society goes, "spirit" is, by definition, a mutable thing. Transient. Ephemeral. If severe and growing youth alienation is part of that spirit, we can safely predict that eventually that portion of the spirit will change. If it does not, the society will expire, since the continuation of society is dependent on some substntial portion of its young becoming socialized adults. And so, one way or another, important elements of the current spirit of our society will surely expire. The issue is simply: what new elements will replace the current ones?

Measures to Increase Personal Observation

The following proposed measures are a checklist accompanied with examples. The test may be applied with varying intensity, depending on the occasions availalbe. The spirit of these measures is congruent with analyses and proposals for improving socialization systems that have been advanced on other recent occasions (Bronfenbrenner, 1970; Coleman, 1974; Laslett, 1973; Newman, 1971; Wynne; 1974). To carry the measures out, we will need changes in many of our attitudes, conventions, laws and administrative rules. Large-scale implementation will obviously take many, many years. But the problem evidently is serious.

1. We need to develop improved incentives for people to carefully personally observe the conduct of children. One step is to increase the ways adults--particularly parents and other relatives--are held legally liable for the misconduct of children. The larger the areas of such liability, the more the adults will be concerned with their childrens' conduct. Parents might be subject to fines or other penalties as a result of their childrens' midconduct.

For instance, if someone's daughter has an illegitimate child, which the public might become obligated to support, it is not unreasonable to say that the female's parents (and the parents of the offending male, too) have perhaps some special responsibility for their daughter's dereliction. Surely they hold a larger responsibility than the ordinary taxpayer. Of course, it may be objected that such measures might lessen frankness between parents and their children: but anytime some conduct is prescribed, a child is likely to hesitate to confess such conduct to his parents. The final logic of such a position is that parents should not forbid or punish any conduct, since all such ordinances and punishment inhibit frankness. Causing the birth of an unwanted

infant is probably a grave enough offense for parents to establish strong and clear prohibitions. In any case, we presumably have had the disturbing increase in illegitimacy just because those prohibitions have declined. Of course, strong disapproval does not necessarily mean sending someone into the driving midnight snow: most probably, it means seriously inculcating certain attitudes in children and adolescents, and staying informed about their social associations.

As another example, legal and conventional changes which gradually (over five to thirty years) diminish the reliance of older and disabled adults on governmental financial (e.g., spoua; security) also assistance/can/be significant. Such changes will stimulate parents to increasingly rely on their children for emotional and financial assistance. This reliance will motivate parents to inculcate responsible attitudes in their children.

Different dress codes for children from different schools enable community members to easily identify the schools attended by courteous or unruly students. Such identification invites personal observation by citizens and school faculty.

Increasing the variety and intensity of supervised authority and responsibility assigned to students and youths in schools and communities fosters personal observation, since the necessary supervision naturally becomes observation.

2. Children and youths should be encouraged to spend more time within the personal observation of older youths or responsible adults. Sponsored activities--sports, scouts, clubs, sunday schools--should be maintained and enlarged. Intra-cohort segregation among youths in and out of school should be discouraged. Older students, in school, should be given authority and responsibilities vis-a-vis younger ones. Zoning codes and developers policies

should discourage the creation of communities that are highly age homogeneous, and which segregate youth from many adult age groups, or which foster bedroom communities, where few adults are about during the day. Housing structures and land use plans can be developed that promote certain modes of observation, as opposed to privacy.

3. Adults and older youths should be stimulated to maintain persisting relationships with individual children and youths. This might be facilitated by measures--taxes, zoning codes, conventions--which discourage geographic mobility. Employers who hire significant numbers of young employees might be given incentives to foster some (not perfect) job/stability among such employees, instead of the very high mobility rates that often pertain in such situations. Schools can revise teacher assignment and specialization patterns, so that individual teachers (in high schools for instance) are responsible for more subjects, and teach those subjects to persisting groups of students over prolonged periods of time; as a result, the same number of teachers will have lengthier contacts with smaller numbers of students. Some schools can develop incentives to discourage student and family inter-school mobility.

4. Increasing handicaps should be gradually placed in the way of impersonal observation systems. Such systems are vulneralbe to abuse, and their very existence serves to discourage the continuation and improvement of personal observation systems. For instance, police cars and police technology are used as arguments against developing improved systems of police personal observation, e.g., walking a beat. We are told that the technology catches more criminals, is less costly, or so on. But the benefits of personal observation accure slowly, and such systems need gradual development. In some ways, their economic cost may apparently be higher than impersonal systems. We may only be willing to seriously engage ourselves in improving our personal observation systems

if we find the operation of our impersonal systems becoming increasingly constrained.

As another instance, schools and colleges should place diminishing reliance on grades and test scores, and give more attention to references and other forms of personal assessment. Such emphasis will gradually cause the improvement of our systems of personal observation, since teachers will become more concerned with observing student's total conduct, and colleges will be concerned with observing the quality of the teacher's observations.

5. We must reconsider the philosophical implications of our current high evaluation of personal privacy. As suggested, that evaluation is partly sustained by the influence of technological and social forces, which have stimulated pro-privacy attitudes that are congruent with our technical and social environment. But observation can be seen as concern, responsibility and love, as well as snooping, prying and intrusion. And privacy, obviously, has bad as well as good sides. Perhaps too many of the values of our society have centered around the positive aspects of privacy, and inadequately recognized the positive aspects of observation--and the irresponsibile, and even destructive, implications of overemphasized privacy. And, as we have seen, man cannot turn from observing his fellows: when personal means decay, he is then necessarily driven to invent impersonal observation techniques to prevent anti-social conduct. The operation of these techniques pose grave social dangers. If we are to escape those dangers, it is time for us to return to a more balanced perception of the real nature of privacy and observation.

REFERENCES

Bronfenbrenner, U. Two worlds of childhood. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1970.

Coleman, J. S., et al. Youth: transition to adulthood. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974.

Cusick, P. Inside high school. New York: Holt, Rhinehart and Winston, 1973.

Durkheim, E. Suicide. New York: Free Press, 1951.

Eisenstadt, S. N. From generation to generation. New York: Free Press, 1956.

Feuer, L. F. The conflict of generations. New York: Basic Books, 1969.

Goffman, E. Behavior in public places. New York: Free Press, 1963.

Heath, D. Growing up in college. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1968.

Homans, G. C. The human group. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1950.

Hogue, D. R. College student values. Sociology of Education, 44, (1970), pp. 170-197.

Houriet, R. Getting back together. New York: Coward, McCann and Geoghegan, 1971.

Laslett, B. The family as a public and private institution: an historical perspective. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 35, (August, 1973)3

Katz, E. Armed love. New York: Bantam, 1973.

Keyes, R. We, the lonely people. New York: Harper and Row, 1973.

Klapp, O. E. The collective search for identity. New York: Holt, Rhinehart, and Winston, 1969.

Newman, F., et al. Report on higher education. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1971.

O'Brien, L. F. No final victories. New York: Doubleday, 1974.

Skinner, B. F. Beyond freedom and dignity. New York: Bantam, 1972.

Stadtfeld, C. K. From the land and back. New York: Scribners, 1972.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. Statistical abstract of the United States, 1973 (94th edition). Washington: Government Printing Office, 1973.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. Statistical history of the United States, colonial times to the present. Fairfield, Connecticut: Stanford, 1963.

U.S. Department of Agriculture. Agricultural statistics, 1969. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1969.

U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Public Health Service. Mortality trends for leading causes of death, United States, 1950-1969. Rockville, Maryland: Health Resources Administration, 1974(a).

U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Public Health Service. Personal Communication, 1974(c).

U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Public Health Service. Second special report on alcohol and health. Rockville, Maryland: National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, 1974(1).

U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Public Health Service. Trends in illegitimacy, 1940-1965. Series 21, No. 15. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1968.

U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, National Center for Social Statistics. Juvenile court statistics, 1971. Washington: National Center for Social Statistics, 1972.

U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, National Center for Health Statistics. Monthly vital statistics report. Vol. 23, No. 8, Supplement, October 31, 1974(b).

White House Conference on Children. Profiles of children. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1970.

Wynne, E. Socialization to adulthood: different concepts, different policies. Interchange, (1974)1, 2. pp. 23-35, 73-78.

Yankelovich, D. Changing youth values in the '70's. New York: The JDR 3rd Fund, 1973.

Yankelovich, D. The changing values on campus. New York: Washington Square Press, Pocket Books, 1972.

National commission on marajuana and drug abuse. Drug use in America: the problem in perspective. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1973.